



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

VAN PELT & YI LLP
10050 N. FOOTHILL BLVD.
SUITE 200
CUPERTINO CA 95014

MAILED

MAR 06 2009

In re Application of	:	OFFICE OF PETITIONS
William Sobel	:	
Application No. 10/642,355	:	DECISION ON PETITION
Filed: August 14, 2003	:	
Attorney Docket No. SYMAP024	:	

This is a decision on the petition under the unavoidable provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(a), filed December 8, 2008, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a) is **DISMISSED**.

Any further petition to revive must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a)." This is **not** a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 704.

This application became abandoned for failure to timely submit the issue and publication fees, as required by the Notice of Allowance and Fee (s) Due, which was mailed June 17, 2008. The Notice of Allowance and Fee (s) Due and the Notice of Allowability set a three (3) month statutory period for reply. Extensions of time were not available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). Accordingly, this application became abandoned on September 18, 2008. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on October 14, 2008.

A grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a) must be accompanied by: (1) the required reply, unless previously filed; (2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(l); (3) a showing to the satisfaction of the Director that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(a) was unavoidable; and (4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(d). The instant petition lacks item (3).

As to item (3), the Office may revive an abandoned application if the delay in responding to the relevant outstanding office requirement is shown to the satisfaction of the Director to have been "avoidable." See, 37 CFR 1.137(a)(3). Decisions on reviving abandoned applications have adopted the reasonably prudent person standard in determining if the delay was unavoidable. Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31, 32-33 (Comm'r Pat. 1887) (the term "unavoidable" is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more greater care or diligence than is

generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business.”); In re Mattullath, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-15 (D.C. Cir. 1912); Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm’r Pat. 139, 141 (Comm’r Pat. 1913). In addition, decisions on revival are made on a “case by case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account.” Smith v. Mossinghoff, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982). A petition to revive an application as unavoidably abandoned cannot be granted where petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing the cause of the unavoidable delay. Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 5 USPQ2D 1130 (N.D. Ind. 1987).

A review of the written record indicates no irregularity in the mailing of the Office action, and, in the absence of any irregularity, there is a strong presumption that the Office action was properly mailed to the practitioner at the address of record. This presumption may be overcome by a showing that the Office action was not in fact received. In this regard, the showing required to establish the failure to receive the Office action must consist of the following:

1. a statement from practitioner stating that the Office action was not received by the practitioner. The statement should also describe the system used for recording an Office action received at the correspondence address of record and establish that the docketing system was sufficiently reliable;
2. a statement from the practitioner attesting to the fact that a search of the file jacket and docket records indicates that the Office action was not received; and
3. a copy of the master docket for the firm docket record where the nonreceived Office action would have been entered had it been received must be attached to and referenced in the practitioner’s statement. If no master docket exists, the practitioner should so state and provide other evidence such, as but not limited: to the application file jacket, incoming mail log; calendar; reminder system or individual docket record for the application in question

Petitioner has failed to meet (3). A copy of a master docket or a statement that a master docket does not exist has not been provided. On petition, petitioner has provided a copy of what appears to be a docket record specifically for the above-identified application. A copy of the practitioner’s record(s) required to show non-receipt of the Office action should include the master docket for the firm. That is, if a three month period for reply was set in the nonreceived Office action, a copy of the master docket report showing all replies docketed for a date three months from the mail date of the nonreceived Office action must be submitted as documentary proof of nonreceipt of the Office action. If no such master docket exists, the practitioner should so state and provide other evidence such as, but not limited to, the following: the application file

jacket; incoming mail log; calendar; reminder system; or the individual docket record for the application in question.

If petitioner cannot supply the evidence necessary, or simply does not wish to, petitioner should consider filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) stating that the delay was unintentional. Public Law 97-247, § 3, 96 Stat. 317 (1982), which revised patent and trademark fees, amended 35 U.S.C. § 41(a)(7) to provide for the revival of an "unintentionally" abandoned application without a showing that the delay in prosecution or in late payment of the issue fee was "unavoidable." This amendment to 35 U.S.C. § 41(a)(7) has been implemented in 37 CFR 1.137(b). An "unintentional" petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by the petition fee.

The filing of a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) cannot be intentionally delayed and therefore must be filed promptly. A person seeking revival due to unintentional delay cannot make a statement that the delay was unintentional unless the entire delay, including the date it was discovered that the application was abandoned until the filing of the petition to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(b), was unintentional. A statement that the delay was unintentional is not appropriate if petitioner intentionally delayed the filing of a petition for revival under 37 CFR 1.137(b).


Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By Mail: Mail Stop PETITION
 Commissioner for Patents
 P. O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand: U. S. Patent and Trademark Office
 Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Petitions
 Randolph Building
 401 Dulany Street
 Alexandria, VA 22314

By facsimile: **(571) 273-8300**
 Attn: Office of Petitions

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3215.



Charlema Grant
Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions